REMARKS

The non-final Office Action mailed June 5, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Applicant has canceled claim 24. Claims 1-18, 20-23 and 25-29 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the withdrawal of the previous rejection.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25 and 26 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okada et al. In paragraph 5 on page 9 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 5, 17, 21 and 27 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. and Rouse. In paragraph 6 on page 12 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. and Collard. In paragraph 7 on page 12 of the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 11, 23, 28 and 29 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. and Boswell.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant's independent claims are directed to the processing of print jobs. The independent claims recite a printing device having the queues (i.e., independent claims 1, 15 and 25) or a print server having the queues (i.e., independent claims 18 and 20).

Okada fails to teach, disclose or suggest a printing device having queues as recited in independent claims 1, 15 and 25. Rather, according to Okada, a file server includes three queues. The printing devices 6 and 7 are coupled to the print server 5. The print server includes storage 14, but Okada does not disclose the storage 14 configured to provide queues. Likewise Okada fails to teach, disclose or suggest a print server having the queues as recited in independent claims 18 and 20.

However, Okada also fails to teach, disclose or suggest forwarding print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device to the residual print queue when the print job is initially received by the printing device. Rather, Okada discloses that the print requester of the client specifies the third queue (q3) 23 of the file server 4 when an ordinary print mode is selected. Thus, Okada

does in fact provide a print queue designation that matches a print queue in the file server 4, i.e., the third queue (q3).

Accordingly, Okada names each of the queues in the file server. Okada merely discloses that the print requester of the client specifies the third queue (q3) 23 of the file server 4 when the print job is not a security print mode or a copy print mode, which are allotted to the first and second queues, respectively.

Thus, independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25 are patentable over Okada because Okada fails to suggest forwarding print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device to the residual print queue when the print job is initially received by the printing device, and because Okada fails to suggest a printing device or a print server having queues.

Rouse fails to overcome the deficiencies of Okada et al. Rouse merely discloses an unmatched queue that contains documents with index values that match the corresponding index values of more than one workcase. Accordingly, the documents do not include a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue, but rather the document includes an index value that matches the index values of more than one workcase. Moreover, Rouse does not convert a print queue designation of a print job having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device, to a residual print queue designation. Rather, Rouse merely states that if the indexes of an incoming document do not match the indexes for any of the existing workcases in the Location queue 76, then the process treats the document as a new workcase and creates a new folder (workcase) for the document. At a later time, the File Unmatched Document process moves the document into the folder, clears the value for F_{Delay}, and deletes the Unmatched queue record.

Accordingly, Rouse does not suggest converting a print queue designation of a print job having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device, to a residual print queue designation. Moreover, Rouse fails to suggest forwarding print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device to the residual print queue when the print job is initially

received by the printing device. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25 are patentable over Okada et al. and Rouse.

Collard fails to overcome the deficiencies of Okada et al. and Rouse. Collard is merely cited as suggest the print job command is transmitted in accordance to a Line Printer Daemon Protocol (LPD Protocol). However, Collard fails to suggest forwarding print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device to the residual print queue when the print job is initially received by the printing device. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25 are patentable over Okada et al., Rouse and Collard.

Boswell fails to overcome the deficiencies of Okada et al., Rouse and Collard. Boswell is merely cited as suggesting commonly filtering the print jobs that identify the print queue designations that do not match a named print queue with a shared filter. However, Boswell fails to suggest forwarding print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device to the residual print queue when the print job is initially received by the printing device. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25 are patentable over Okada et al., Rouse, Collard and Boswell.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 are also patentable over the references, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25. Further dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicant reserves the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: _____

Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204